

REMARKS

The present application was filed on December 7, 2000 with claims 1 through 24. Claims 1 through 24 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application.

5 In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 8-10, 13-16, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ireton (United States Patent Number 5,797,120), rejected claims 17, 18, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tohkura et al. (Spectral Smoothing Technique in PARCOR Speech Analysis-Synthesis), rejected claims 2 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
10 unpatentable over Ireton, rejected claims 3, 12, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ireton and Tohkura et al., and further in view of Pearson (United States Patent Number 5,400,434), and rejected claims 7 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ireton, and further in view of Tohkura et al.

Independent Claims 1, 10, 17 and 22

15 Independent claims 1, 10, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ireton, and claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tohkura et al. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Ireton teaches "increasing an amount of energy in low frequency components of said pitch contour" (col. 8, lines 23-40). Regarding claim 17, the Examiner asserts that Tokhura
20 discloses "filtering said pitch contour with an impulse response filter having a pole at a desired low frequency value" (section Bandwidth expansion method).

Applicants note that, in the text cited by the Examiner, Ireton teaches that "the gain controls 308a through 308n *enable the power or energy in each of the frequency sub-bands to be individually controlled* and enable a wide range of band-
25 variable noise sequences...The band-variable noise generator 300 of the present invention can *selectively add noise* to various parts of the signal spectrum, thus providing a distinct naturalness to the speech signal." (Col. 8, lines 25-40; emphasis added.) Ireton does not, however, disclose or suggest increasing an amount of energy in low frequency components of said *pitch contour* and does not disclose or suggest adding band limited
30 noise to said *pitch contour*.

Applicants note that, in the text cited by the Examiner, Tokhura teaches a method to “eliminate extremely sharp peaks in the spectral envelope.” Applicants could find no disclosure or suggestion by Tokhura to filter the pitch contour with an impulse response filter having a pole at a desired low frequency value.

5 Independent claims 1 and 22 require increasing an “amount of energy in low frequency components of said pitch contour.” Independent claim 10 requires adding band limited noise to said pitch contour. Independent claim 17 requires “*filtering said pitch contour with an impulse response filter having a pole at a desired low frequency value.*”

10 Thus, Ireton and Tohkura et al., alone or in any combination, do not disclose or suggest increasing an amount of energy in low frequency components of said pitch contour, as required by independent claims 1 and 22, do not disclose or suggest adding band limited noise to said pitch contour, as required by independent claim 10, and do not disclose or suggest filtering said pitch contour with an impulse response filter
15 having a pole at a desired low frequency value, as required by independent claim 17.

Dependent Claims 2-9, 11-16, 18-21 and 23-24

Dependent claims 4-6, 8, 9, 13-16, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ireton, claims 18, 20, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tohkura et al., claims 2 and 11 were rejected
20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ireton, claims 3, 12, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ireton and Tohkura et al., and further in view of Pearson, and claims 7 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ireton, and further in view of Tohkura et al.

Claims 2-9, 11-16, 18-21 and 23-24 are dependent on claims 1, 10, 17, and
25 22, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Ireton, Tohkura et al., and Pearson (alone or in any combination) because of their dependency from independent claims 1, 10, 17, and 22 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-24, are in condition for allowance
30 and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

5

Respectfully submitted,



Date: March 28, 2005

10

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

15